

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*  
Serial No: 10/072,898  
Filing Date: February 12, 2002  
Page: 13 of 16

### REMARKS

In response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed **December 24, 2008** (hereinafter "Office Action"), claims 27 and 54 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or newly added. Therefore, claims 27-38, 40-51, 54-65, and 67-78 remain pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

### INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants are submitting herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and respectfully request that the Examiner consider the cited references and provide a signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 for this submission with the next Office Action.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 27 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the recitations of "a detected recipient," "detecting a recipient," and "the detected recipient" in the body of the claims "is unclear and confusing" and therefore "makes the claims indefinite" [Office Action, pg. 2, ¶12]. Applicants disagree with the rejection set forth by the Examiner, as the claims pending prior to the foregoing amendment were clearly definite and would not prevent a person of ordinary skill in the art from interpreting the metes and bounds of the claims. However,

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*  
Serial No: 10/072,898  
Filing Date: February 12, 2002  
Page: 14 of 16

*solely* in an effort to expedite prosecution, and in no way acquiescing to the propriety of the alleged rejection, claims 27 and 54 have been amended to address the concerns of the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 is earnestly sought.

#### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner has indicated that claims 50-51 and 77-78 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims [Office Action, pg. 7, ¶4].

#### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 27-38, 40-49, 54-65, and 67-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,661,781 to DeJager (hereinafter "DeJager") [Office Action, pg. 2, ¶3]. Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reason that DeJager neither explicitly nor impliedly discloses each of the features of at least independent claims 27 and 54.

In particular, independent claims 27 and 54 each recite, *inter alia*, the features of enabling a subscriber to subscribe to at least one service that can output personalized information:

...enabling at least one subscriber to subscribe to at least one service that can output personalized information, and to specify preferences for the content and presentation of service output information, as well as delivery parameters for

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*  
Serial No: 10/072,898  
Filing Date: February 12, 2002  
Page: 15 of 16

receiving service output information, the delivery parameters including at least one device to which service output information is to be delivered, and delivery instructions based on a detected recipient;

The claimed subscription process comprises enabling the subscriber to, among other things, *specify preferences* for the *content* and *presentation* of *service output information*. While DeJager appears to disclose enabling users to re-direct incoming messages to a different messaging address, or to receive notifications of newly arrived messages, the portions of DeJager [col. 2, lines 7-19; col. 5, lines 1-8; and FIG. 6] relied upon by the Examiner [Office Action, pg. 3] do not disclose the feature of enabling a subscriber to *specify preferences* for the *content* and *presentation* of *service output information*.

For *at least* the foregoing reasons, DeJager fails to disclose each of the features of *at least* independent claims 27 and 54. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 27 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is legally improper and should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 50-51 and 77-78 are indicated as being allowable by the Examiner, and the remaining dependent claims 28-38, 40-49, 55-65, and 67-76 are allowable because they each ultimately depend from an allowable independent claim, as well as for the further features they recite.

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*  
Serial No: 10/072,898  
Filing Date: February 12, 2002  
Page: 16 of 16

**CONCLUSION**

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 16, 2009

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Bradford C. Blaise  
Registration No. 47,429

Customer No. 00909

P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
Direct Dial: 703.770.7741  
Main: 703.770.7900  
Fax: 703.770.7901